Subject: Re: New reflected thoughts towards railML 2.3 infrastructure extension proposal line sections
Posted by christian.rahmig on Mon, 20 Nov 2017 15:05:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Torben,

Am 14.07.2017 um 09:44 schrieb Torben Brand:
> [...]
> To model the open section (or other line sections/segment) I
> suggest to keep the proposed element <lineSection>. I suggest to change
> the suggested <lineSection>@type:"path"
> to "openSection, as this seems to be a better term (but I
> am, as always, open for other suggestions. Also, I will
> receive guidance for English terms from Network Rail
> resources in August). Alternative if no common ground can
> be found for defining "open section" we suggest to use the
> national value: "NO:linjen".

did you already get guidance for English terms from Network Rail? I am
curious to hear/read whether they prefer "openSection" or "path".

>
> An alternative is to make a new
> <ocp/propOperational>@type:"openSection". But I would prefer
> the line section choice as an open section is not an ocp and
> the an open section "ocp" could contain multiple other ocps.
> What does the forum think?

I agree. An operational point is an operational point and the railway
line/track in between can be defined as line section.

Best regards
Christian

--
Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany   www.railml.org